
Typology of Pretty's Participation in The Development of Ecology-Based Tourism Destinations

Muharis Muharis¹, Muhamad Alam Setiawan²

¹Universitas Bumigora

²Universitas Bumigora

E-mail: muharis@universitasbumigora.ac.id¹, alam.setiawan@universitasbumigora.ac.id²

Article History:

Received: 01 Januari 2025

Revised: 21 Januari 2025

Accepted: 25 Januari 2025

Keywords: *ecology-based tourism, pretty's typology of participation, tourism destination*

Abstract: *The development of ecotourism-based tourist destinations has become an increasingly popular approach in Indonesia for environmental conservation and enhancing the well-being of local communities. This study aims to analyse the level of local community participation in the development of ecotourism destinations using Pretty's typology of participation and to identify the factors influencing it. The methodology employed is qualitative descriptive data analysis, with data obtained from a literature review encompassing international and national journals, documents, books, and other information sources. The research findings indicate that community participation in ecotourism development ranges from passive participation to self-mobilization, with interactive participation being the most ideal form to ensure social, economic, and environmental sustainability. Interactive and functional participation, where the community actively engages in decision-making and implementation, have been shown to enhance a sense of ownership and responsibility towards the environment and create sustainable economic opportunities. Additionally, the case study in Bale Mangrove Dusun Poton Bako demonstrates that management by the local community can achieve the independence of the tourist destination. By understanding the dynamics of community participation, more effective strategies can be formulated to optimize the role of the community in the development of ecotourism. This will create a synergy between environmental conservation and the improvement of community welfare.*

INTRODUCTION

The development of tourism destinations based the concern in environment or the so-called ecotourism has become a popular approach in various countries, including Indonesia, as an effort to preserve the environment and improve the welfare of local communities. Ecotourism is a

journey, refers to tourism definition, carried out with awareness and concern for the environment, which leads to the development of natural areas and improves the quality of life of local communities, while preserving natural wealth (Haryanto, 2014; Arida, 2017; Yuniati, 2018).

In this context, local community participation is a key factor in achieving sustainability and success in ecologically based tourism programs. Local community participation in the development of ecologically based tourism destinations involves various aspects, including planning, management and utilization of the resulting economic benefits. As research done by (Wibowo & Belia, 2023) shows, the forms of local community participation are participation in planning, participation during tourism implementation, and participation during monitoring and evaluation. These three aspects are important by the goal of ensuring that local communities are not only passive recipients of development results, but also become active actors who help determine the direction and form of development.

Other studies also show that the active participation of local communities can increase their sense of ownership and responsibility for environmental sustainability and create sustainable economic opportunities (Drumm & Moore, 2005). Another conclusion stated that the main principle in sustainable development is humans (Arifin & Ardhiansyah, 2020). When local communities are directly involved, they are more likely to maintain and preserve natural resources which are the main attraction of ecological tourism destinations. In addition, the involvement of local communities in natural resource management can reconcile tourism and conservation interests (Saarinen, 2014).

The typology of Community participation is a popular concept which was proposed by Jules N. Pretty in 1995 (Pretty, 1995). This typology divides community participation into seven categories based on their level of involvement and influence in the decision-making process. These categories include:

1. Manipulative Participation: The community is nominally involved, but in fact they have no power or influence in the decision-making process. They are just noted for administrative need.
2. Passive Participation: The society, considered as participation, is informed about decisions that have been taken without any opportunity to provide input or to be involved in deciding the decision.
3. Participation by Consultation (Consultative Participation): The society is asked for their opinion, but decision making remains in the hands of outside parties.
4. Participation for Material Incentives: People are involved because of material incentives, such as wages or prizes.
5. Functional Participation: People are involved in groups to achieve predetermined goals, and begin to actively participate in the decision-making process.
6. Interactive Participation: The community is actively involved in the decision-making process and implementation of activities, and has the power to influence the final results.
7. Self-Mobilization: Societies take their own initiative for the change without outside interference, although it may still seek external support for resources or technical advice.

Ecotourism aims to promote environmental and social sustainability (Susilawati, 2016; Putri et al., 2022; Angela, 2023). To achieve this goal, active participation of local communities is necessary. Developing ecotourism destinations that involve local communities in every stage of planning and implementation can increase their sense of ownership and responsibility for environmental sustainability and local economic sustainability.

Manipulative Participation and Passive Participation often do not provide long-term

benefits because people are only used as objects rather than subjects in development. Both types of participation can result in distrust and lack of support from local communities, which ultimately hinders the success of ecotourism programs. Consultative Participation and Participation for Material Incentives show increased involvement, but are still limited in terms of real influence on decisions taken. However, participation at this level can be the first step to building better relationships between developers and local communities.

Functional Participation and Interactive Participation are more ideal in the ecotourism context because they involve the community in a more substantive process. In functional participation, the community not only contributes to the implementation of activities, but also has a voice in planning and evaluation. Interactive Participation allows communities to actively influence and direct destination development, which is critical to ensuring that local interests and needs are met. Self-Mobilization is the highest and most ideal level of participation, where communities have full control over development initiatives and proactively seek ways to improve their conditions. In the context of ecotourism, self-mobilization can occur when local communities have a high awareness of the value of ecotourism and are able to organize themselves to utilize it sustainably.



Figure 1. Pretty's typology of participation
Source: adopted from Pretty, 1995

Several case studies show that successful ecotourism destinations generally have high levels of community participation. It is in line with the argument from (Mowforth & Munt, 2008) that the higher the level of local participation, the better (by any definition) the project. High local participation ensures that ecotourism projects can adapt to local needs and conditions, reduce the potential for conflict, and increase acceptance and support from the community. In

addition, community involvement also contributes to strengthening local capacity through training and empowerment, which in turn can improve their quality of life.

Previous research regarding local community participation in the development of ecologically based tourism destinations has several similarities and differences that are interesting to observe. The main similarity of these studies is the focus on the importance of local community participation in achieving sustainable tourism goals. Research by (Chan et al., 2021) highlights the limited participation of local communities in Lower Kinabatangan, Sabah, which is caused by a lack of capital and knowledge about tourism activities. Meanwhile, (Rusata, 2019) studied the forms of local community participation in Gunung Padang, Cianjur, with the aim of ensuring sustainable tourism development. (Guerrero-Moreno & Oliveira-Junior, 2024) through their bibliometric analysis shows an increase in publications regarding CBET (Community-Based Ecotourism), but highlights the lack of research involving indigenous populations and the use of quantitative methods to assess the impact of ecotourism on biodiversity conservation. Research on Pretty's Participation Typology focuses on analysing the level of local community participation in the development of ecologically based tourism destinations using Pretty's framework to identify the factors that influence this participation.

The difference lies in the location context and methodology used. The first study conducted a case study in Lower Kinabatangan, while the second study focused on Mount Padang. The latter study provides a broad analysis through a global bibliometric study without focusing on one particular location. The research on Pretty's Typology of Participation aims to analyse the level of participation of local communities in developing ecologically based tourism destinations using Pretty's typology of participation and identifying factors that influence this participation. By understanding the dynamics of local community participation, it is hoped that more effective strategies can be formulated to optimize the role of local communities in developing ecology-based tourism, thereby creating a synergy between environmental preservation and improving community welfare.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research applied a qualitative descriptive data analysis technique (Wardiyanta, 2017). This technique aims to provide an in-depth and detailed description of the data collected from the field. In this process, data obtained from literature reviews which include searches of journals, literature publications, and various sources of information such as documents, books, scientific journals, newspapers, magazines, and websites via the internet - are analysed and interpreted systematically. Furthermore, the analysis is carried out logically, systematically and consistently. The author prepares arguments based on the evidence contained in the literature studied. Each claim submitted is supported by relevant evidence, thus strengthening the validity of the findings presented. With a thorough and structured approach, this article ensures that readers can follow the flow of thought clearly and understand the arguments put forward.

A qualitative descriptive approach allows researchers to capture the complexity of the phenomenon being studied. Through deep and detailed descriptions, researchers can reveal the perspectives, experiences and understanding of research subjects in more depth. This technique also allows researchers to identify patterns, relationships and dynamics that exist in the data, thereby producing more meaningful and contextual insights.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Tourism development, especially in rural and ecotourism areas, does not only focus on increasing the number of tourists but also on social, economic and environmental sustainability. Local community participation in tourism development is key factor to ensuring that the benefits of this industry can impact the local communities as well as maintaining environmental sustainability. Therefore, understanding the typology of community participation is important for designing effective interventions and strategies.

Jules Pretty developed a typology of participation that classifies community participation into several categories based on the level of involvement and control possessed by the community. This typology helps in analyzing and designing more inclusive and participatory approaches. The following are the results and discussion of participation typology according to Pretty:

“There are three main organizational principles those are membership which is voluntary and open, management is carried out democratically, and independence.” (data 1, Komariah et al., 2018)

Interactive Participation - Membership is voluntary and open: This reflects that the members have the freedom to join and engage without coercion, which is the hallmark of interactive participation. Management is carried out democratically: Interactive participation emphasizes that members are actively involved in the decision-making process and have a real influence on the final results. Independence: This indicates that the organization supports and facilitates its members to become independent, which is one of the goals of interactive participation, where participants not only receive and follow instructions, but also have the capacity to take their own initiative.

“The results of this research show that the tourist destinations in Bale Mangrove Poton Bako Hamlet are managed directly by the community with the aim of making Poton Bako Hamlet an independent tourist destination” (data 2, Azwari et al., 2023).

Data 2 shows that the tourist destination in Bale Mangrove Dusun Poton Bako is managed directly by the community with the aim of making the hamlet an independent tourist destination. Based on the typology of participation proposed by Pretty, this participation can be categorized as interactive participation. In this type of participation, the community is actively involved in the decision-making process and implementation of projects or activities. They are not only provided with information or consultation, but also contribute directly and have control over the initiatives undertaken.

The direct involvement of the community shows that their position is not only the beneficiary but also the main actor in management. The goal of independence reflects community ownership and control over this initiative. Therefore, if community participation is limited to receiving information or being asked for opinions without direct involvement in management and decision making, then it may fall into other categories such as passive participation or participation by consultation. However, based on the description of the data provided, the participation that occurred in Bale Mangrove Dusun Poton Bako was more in line with interactive participation.

“Local community-based principles, carried out with openness to job vacancies, policy making and arts and culture training.” (data 3, Setiawan & Batubara, 2022).

Data 3 shows that there is local community involvement in various aspects such work,

policy making and training. Based on the typology of participation proposed by Pretty, this can be categorized as functional participation. In this type of participation, communities are involved in groups to achieve predetermined project goals. This participation often occurs after major decisions have been made, and community groups are brought in to achieve specific goals or to increase the efficiency of project implementation.

Meanwhile, openness to job vacancies indicates that local communities are given the opportunity to engage in project-related work, but perhaps within a predetermined framework. Policy making shows consultation and contribution in decision making. Cultural arts training shows an effort to empower local communities with certain skills that are useful for a larger project or goal.

This means that if the community has full control and involvement in all aspects of decision making and implementation, it can be categorized into interactive participation. However, from this description, participation focuses more on involvement in certain functions in existing projects, which is more in line with functional participation.

“By utilizing the support of the village community there, the ecotourism program that has been promoted by the regional government can run properly and be able to increase the welfare and livelihood of the people of Ciamis Regency as a whole.” (data 4, Dadi, 2022).

In participating in consultations, the public is asked for their views and opinions. This consultation process can help in decision making, but the final decision-making power still in the hands of the management or external parties. Support from the village community shows that they are invited to support and possibly provide input.

“The results of research show there is a strong and significant relationship between community participation with socio-cultural sustainability, while community participation with ecology and economic sustainability shows a moderate and significant correlation.” (data 5, Rachman & Mardiana, 2018).

Data 5 shows a strong relationship between community participation and socio-cultural sustainability, as well as a moderate relationship with ecological and economic sustainability. Based on the typology of participation proposed by Pretty, this can be categorized as interactive participation. In this type of participation, the community is actively involved and has influence in decision making and implementation of projects or activities. They play an active role in the process and have control over the results achieved.

The strong and significant relationship with socio-cultural sustainability shows that community participation does not only occur at the level of information or consultation, but that they actually contribute and are involved in a meaningful way and have a significant impact on socio-cultural sustainability. Moderate and significant relationship with ecological and economic sustainability even though the influence is moderate, this still shows that society is involved in various aspects of sustainability, including ecology and economy.

If community participation is limited to only receiving information or simply only being asked for opinions without direct involvement in decision making and management, then this may be more in line with other categories such as participation by consultation. However, based on this description, the participation that occurs has a significant impact on various aspects of sustainability, indicating that this is more in line with interactive participation.

“The involvement of the village community in there is only high during the Danau Sentani Festival (FDS) which is driven by the government. Looking at the level of community

participation that falls into the category of tokenism, outside parties, especially the district government, need to play an active role in efforts to empower the community in tourism development programs in the village". (data 6, Sitorus et al., 2018).

Data 6 shows that community involvement level is only high during the implementation of certain activities initiated by the government and this is categorized as "tokenism". Based on the typology of participation proposed by Pretty, this can be categorized as participation for material incentives. In this type of participation, people participate in the hope of receiving material incentives, such as wages or goods. Participation is usually limited to the performance of specific tasks and does not include involvement in decision making or project management.

High level involvement during the implementation of FDS is driven by incentives or direct benefits received by the community when implementing certain activities. Participation that is considered "tokenism" indicates that community involvement is only symbolic and has no real influence in decision making or management.

Thus, if the community has control and is actively involved in decision making, it can fall into the category of interactive participation. However, based on this description, community participation is more symbolic and limited to carrying out activities initiated by outside parties, which is more in line with participation for material incentives or a form of tokenism.

"The community took the initiative to open tourist destinations to provide benefits both economically and for the sustainability of existing water resources." (data 7, Saputra, 2021).

Data 7 shows that the community is not only involved, but also takes the initiative in opening tourist destinations for economic benefits and sustainability of water resources. Based on the typology of participation proposed by Pretty, this can be categorized as self-mobilization. In this type of participation, the community takes its own initiative to initiate and manage activities or projects without direct intervention from outside parties. They have full control over the decisions and resources used, as well as the goals to be achieved.

Community initiative in the form of taking steps to open tourist destinations, shows independence and local initiative. The economic benefits and sustainability of water resources is a clear goal to improve economic prosperity and safeguarding water resources shows that communities understand and act on their local needs.

If community participation is only limited to implementing or supporting initiatives from outside parties, it falls into other categories such as functional participation or participation by consultation. However, based on this description, the participation that occurs is the result of initiative and full control of the community, which is more in line with self-mobilization.

"The results of the analysis show that the concept of community-based ecotourism in the context of tourism development refers to development that involves the community as the main stakeholder in resource utilization." (data 8, Lasaiba, 2022).

Data 8 shows that the community is not only involved, but is also considered the main stakeholder in the development and utilization of tourism resources. Based on the typology of participation proposed by Pretty, this can be categorized as interactive participation. In this type of participation, the community is actively involved and has significant influence in decision making and implementation of projects or activities. They play an active role in the process and have control over the results achieved.

The community as the main stakeholder shows that the community is not only the implementer or beneficiary, but has the main role and control in resource utilization. Community-based development reflects that the community is involved in the entire development process,

from planning to implementation, and has a role in decision making.

If the community is only involved in implementation without having control or a role in decision making, it may fall into other categories such as functional participation or participation for material incentives. However, based on this description, the participation that occurred shows the active and significant involvement of the community as the main stakeholder, which is more in line with interactive participation.

“The results of the study show that community participation is the key that must be implemented for the successful development of rural tourism in Indonesia”. (data 9, Musthofa, 2019).

Data 9 emphasizes the importance of community participation in the development of rural tourism. However, this text does not explicitly explain the level or form of community participation in question. Therefore, we need to make interpretations based on the general context of community participation in tourism development.

Interactive Participation means that the community is actively involved in the decision-making process and implementation of projects or activities. In the sense of not only being given information or consultation, but also contributing directly and having control over the initiatives carried out. Functional Participation is community involvement in groups to achieve predetermined project goals. This participation often occurs after major decisions have been made, and community groups are brought in to achieve specific goals or to increase the efficiency of project implementation.

If the participation in question is active involvement in the entire process of rural tourism development, from planning to implementation, and the community has a role and control in decision making, then this includes interactive participation. If the participation in question is more about community involvement in implementing projects that have been determined by other parties, to achieve efficiency and successful implementation, then this includes functional participation. However, without further information, and considering the importance of community participation which is said to be the key to success, it is likely that this data refers to the importance of interactive participation, where the community plays an active role in the entire process of rural tourism development.

“The results of this research show that the community-based tourism development model emphasizes the “role or active participation of the community in developing tourism.” (data 10, Permatasari, 2022).

Data 10 shows that community participation is not only expected but also active in the tourism development process. Based on the typology of participation proposed by Pretty, this data can be categorized as interactive participation. In this type of participation, the community is actively involved in decision making and implementation of projects or activities. They are not only provided with information or consultation but also contribute directly and have control over the initiatives undertaken.

Community role or active participation emphasizes that community participation is active, which means they are not only involved passively but play an active role in the development process. The Community-based tourism development model shows that tourism development is designed to involve the community as the main stakeholder, which reflects their direct control and involvement.

Thus, based on the description in the text, the participation that occurs can be categorized as interactive participation. This is because communities play an active and significant role in

tourism development, which goes beyond mere consultation or receipt of benefits. They are directly involved in decision making and implementation of tourism activities.

CONCLUSION

Pretty's Participation Typology offers a valuable framework for understanding and increasing community participation in ecotourism destination development. By actively involving local communities and empowering them to take an important role in decision making, ecotourism destinations can be developed in a more sustainable manner, benefiting both the environment and the socio-economic welfare of local communities. Implementing appropriate strategies to overcome participation challenges is also critical to achieving long-term success in ecotourism.

Sustainable tourism development in rural and ecotourism areas must emphasize the active participation of local communities. Based on Jules Pretty's typology of participation, community involvement in decision making and project implementation—as happened in Bale Mangrove Dusun Poton Bako—shows the importance of interactive participation that gives full control to the community. Apart from that, other forms of participation such as functional participation, tokenism, and self-mobilization also have a role in different contexts. However, to achieve effective social, economic and environmental sustainability, meaningful and active community participation is key. The strong relationship between community participation and socio-cultural sustainability and the moderate relationship with ecological and economic sustainability underscore the importance of the community's role in the development of sustainable rural tourism in Indonesia.

REFERENCES

- Angela, V. F. (2023). Strategi Pengembangan Ekowisata dalam Mendukung Konservasi Alam Danau Tahai. *Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Pendidikan Sejarah*, 8(3), 984–993. <http://jim.unsyiah.ac.id/sejarah/mm>
- Arida, I. N. S. (2017). Ekowisata: Pengembangan, Partisipasi Lokal, dan Tantangan Ekowisata. In *Denpasar, Cakra Press*.
- Arifin, P., & Ardiansyah, N. N. (2020). Penerapan Komunikasi Pembangunan Berkelanjutan. *Jurnal Nomosleca*, 6(April).
- Azwari, L., Fathurrahim, F., & Yulendra, L. (2023). Strategi Pengembangan Ekowisata Mangrove Di Destinasi Wisata Bale Mangrove Dengan Analisis Swot Di Dusun Poton Bako Desa Jerowaru. *Journal of Responsible Tourism*, 08(2), 725–736.
- Chan, J. K. L., Marzuki, K. M., & Mohtar, T. M. (2021). Local community participation and responsible tourism practices in ecotourism destination: A case of lower kinabatangan, sabah. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 13(23). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su132313302>
- Dadi, D. (2022). Ekonomi Dan Ekologi: Dampak Terhadap Pembangunan Ekowisata. *Journal of Management and Bussines*, 4(8.5.2017), 2003–2005. www.aging-us.com
- Drumm, A., & Moore, A. (2005). Ecotourism Development: A Manual for Conservation Planners and Managers Volume. In *Nature: Vol. I*.
- Guerrero-Moreno, M. A., & Oliveira-Junior, J. M. B. (2024). Approaches, Trends, and Gaps in Community-Based Ecotourism Research: A Bibliometric Analysis of Publications between 2002 and 2022. *Historia Contemporanea*, 16(7). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16072639>
- Haryanto, J. T. (2014). Model Pengembangan Ekowisata Dalam Mendukung Kemandirian Ekonomi Daerah Studi Kasus Provinsi Diy. *Jurnal Kawistara*, 4(3).

- <https://doi.org/10.22146/kawistara.6383>
- Komariah, N., Saepudin, E., & Yusup, P. M. (2018). Pengembangan Desa Wisata Berbasis Kearifan Lokal. *Jurnal Pariwisata Pesona*, 3(2), 158–174. <https://doi.org/10.26905/jpp.v3i2.2340>
- Lasaiba, M. A. (2022). Pengembangan Ekowisata Berbasis Masyarakat: Sebuah Studi Literatur. *Jurnal Ilmiah*, 15, No. 1(April), 1–14.
- Mowforth, M., & Munt, I. (2008). Tourism and sustainability. In *Tourism and Sustainability* (pp. 83–119). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203891056.ch4>
- Musthofa, B. M. (2019). Strategi Mengembangkan Inisiatif dan Partisipasi Lokal Untuk Mengembangkan Wisata Perdesaan Bagi Peningkatan Kesejahteraan Masyarakat. *Jurnal Vokasi Indonesia*, 7(2). <https://doi.org/10.7454/jvi.v7i2.147>
- Permatasari, I. (2022). Peran Model Pengembangan Pariwisata Berbasis Masyarakat (Community Based Tourism) Dalam Mewujudkan Pariwisata Berkelanjutan (Sustainable Tourism) di Bali. *Kertha Wicaksana*, 16(2), 164–171. <https://doi.org/10.22225/kw.16.2.2022.164-171>
- Pretty, J. (1995). The many interpretations of participations. *Focus*, 16(February), 4–5.
- Putri, E. D. H. P., Yulianto, A., Wardani, D. M., & Saputro, L. E. (2022). Dampak Ekonomi, Sosial dan Lingkungan Terhadap Ekowisata Berbasis Masyarakat. *Jurnal Ilmiah Pariwisata*, 27(3), 317–327.
- Rachman, M. I., & Mardiana, R. (2018). Hubungan Partisipasi Masyarakat Dengan Keberlanjutan Ekologi, Sosial-Budaya Dan Ekonomi Dalam Ekowisata Religi. *Jurnal Sains Komunikasi Dan Pengembangan Masyarakat [JSKPM]*, 2(4), 509–524.
- Rusata, T. (2019). Partisipasi Masyarakat Lokal dalam Pengembangan Destinasi Wisata Berkelanjutan: Studi Kasus Situs Gunung Padang Cianjur. *Jurnal Kepariwisata Indonesia: Jurnal Penelitian Dan Pengembangan Kepariwisata Indonesia*, 13(2), 79–96. <https://doi.org/10.47608/jki.v13i22019.79-96>
- Saarinen, J. (2014). Critical sustainability: Setting the limits to growth and responsibility in tourism. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 6(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su6010001>
- Saputra, A. D. (2021). Pengemasan Atraksi Wisata Susur Sungai Klegung dengan Menggunakan Pendekatan Potensi Wisata. *Media Wisata*, 18(1), 113–128. <https://doi.org/10.36276/mws.v18i1.82>
- Setiawan, A. S., & Batubara, R. P. (2022). Penerapan Prinsip Ekowisata di Situ Gede sebagai Daya Tarik Wisata Unggulan Kota Bogor. *Altasia Jurnal Pariwisata Indonesia*, 4(2), 45. <https://doi.org/10.37253/altasia.v4i2.6758>
- Sitorus, Y. L. M., Purcahyono, J., Yanthy, N. O., Pengajar, S., Studi, P., Wilayah, P., & Ustj, K. (2018). Partisipasi Masyarakat Kampung Dalam Aktivitas Pariwisata Di Pantai Khalkote, Distrik Sentani Timur, Kabupaten Jayapura. *Jurnal Arsitektur Dan Planologi*, 8(2), 97.
- Susilawati, S. (2016). Pengembangan Ekowisata Sebagai Salah Satu Upaya Pemberdayaan Sosial, Budaya Dan Ekonomi Di Masyarakat. *Jurnal Geografi Gea*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.17509/gea.v8i1.1690>
- Wardiyanta. (2017). *Metode Penelitian Pariwisata*. ANDI Yogyakarta.
- Wibowo, M. S., & Belia, L. A. (2023). Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Pengembangan Pariwisata Berkelanjutan. *Jurnal Manajemen Perhotelan Dan Pariwisata*, 6(1), 25–32. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jmpp.v6i1.58108>
- Yuniati, N. (2018). Analisis Daya Saing Ekowisata Dengan Pendekatan Porter’S Diamond Model Kasus Di Yogyakarta. *Kepariwisata: Jurnal Ilmiah*, 12(03), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.47256/kepariwisataan.v12i03.75>